

## 1.Executive Summary

- In CC 2.25.49, it is stated that one has to accept direct statements and avoid his own opinions
- Śrīla Prabhupāda states that any conflict of instructions in teachings of guru and sadhu must be reconciled with *śāstras* (CC 2.20.352). Hence, the direct statements of SB 4.12.32 purport that woman could not be a *Dīkṣā-guru* is the final statement.
- The book in contention unscrupulously discounts SB 4.12.32 purport
- Misrepresentation of Vedic culture and Vedic scriptures:
  - Not a single clear statement from any śāstra prohibiting women from initiating disciples.
  - No rule preventing ladies from becoming dīkṣā-gurus in the pāñcarātriṁka system
  - Upavīta thread not integral to chanting Gāyatrī mantras
  - Sacred thread of brāhmaṇas’ attire introduced only in recent times.
  - Women in Vedic culture wore sacred thread (fabricated Parvati Statue with sacred thread); atheism exposed in author’s work to deride Vedic culture.
  - Goddess Sarasvatī was Lord Brahma’s first female *Dīkṣā-guru*.
- Outright misleading and cheating by hiding evidences against FDGs
  - p.51— the authors out rightly cheat the readers by removing a part of Srila Prabhupada’s conversation which states that women can become *ācāryas* only in very special cases:

**Prabhupāda:** So a crazy man’s statement is not accepted. Child’s statement, crazy man’s statement, unauthorized person’s statement, blind man’s statement, we cannot accept.

**Ātreya Ṛṣi:** A woman’s statement?

**Prabhupāda:** Huh?

**Ātreya Ṛṣi:** A woman’s... **[statement?]**

**Prabhupāda:** If a woman is perfect in Kṛṣṇa consciousness... Just like Jāhnavā-devī, Lord Nityānanda’s wife, she was ācārya. She was ācārya. She was controlling the whole Vaiṣṇava community. . . . **[Ātreya Ṛṣi: Lord Nityānanda?**

**Prabhupāda:** ~~Wife. Jāhnavā-devī.~~ She was controlling the whole Gauḍīya Vaiṣṇava community.

**Ātreya Ṛṣi:** Do you have references about that in any of your books, Śrīla Prabhupāda?

**Prabhupāda:** I don’t think. But there are many ācāryas. Maybe somewhere I might have mentioned. It is not that woman cannot be ācārya.

**[Generally, they do not become. In very special case. But Jāhnavā-devī was accepted as, but she did not declare.]**

– Room Conversation, San Diego, 29 June 1972

The yellow part is deliberately removed from the quote **because** just before this quote, on p.46-47, the authors mislead readers by saying that Jahnava-devi was not a special case:

Jāhnavādevī wasn’t presented as an exclusive excellent exception, as a personality beyond the beyond that women can never emulate. No, Jāhnavā-devī was mentioned as an illustration of a principle, as a model that normal women could follow.

- On page 70 they use of magic ellipses to mask off Śrīla Prabhupāda’s statements and create their own narrative that ISKCON women need not be protected by father, husband, or son:

So to have good population, the women should be very chaste.... But if woman is not protected very strictly, it is very difficult .... Of course, when woman comes to Kṛṣṇa consciousness, that position is different. We are speaking of ordinary woman ... So when we study things from material point of view, these things are to be taken care. But when a man or woman becomes Kṛṣṇa conscious, he or she takes care of herself or himself ... Arjuna is speaking of ordinary woman. – Lecture on Bhagavad-gītā 1.40, London, 28 July 1973

- Use of ellipses to stitch their own narrative on Sacred Thread & women’s being brahmana (hiding anti-feminist part from Srila Prabhupada’s speech) on page 232
- Use of ellipses on Srila Prabhupada’s lecture on Śrīmad-Bhāgavatam 1.8.51—May 13, 1973, Los Angeles on pages 71, 154, 253, 269 to create their own narrative that Srila Prabhupada did not care for Woman’s position stated in Vedic culture and that he wanted different rules for ISKCON’s women
- Mis-representing the words of Scholars of Other sampradayas
  - Stating that M.A. Laksami Thathacharya, Sri Sampradaya said they had FDG in their parampara. (M.A. LT has already denied this and evidence is provided in the body of text)
- Faulty and dangerous Hermeneutics:
  - SP Books are not always the final authority. “When taken out of context, certain passages in Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books might generate confusion and even false conclusions.”
  - Let us have a Trial allowing FDGs; in case it fails, we can revert back our decision anytime
  - Srila Prabhupada is final pramana — divorcing him from sastra.
- Directly confronting Srila Prabhupada’s stance on some matters
  - On page 88-90, the author(s) say Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura and Śrīla Prabhupāda are absurd
  - On page 43, the author(s) say Śrīla Prabhupāda’s books are confusing by exploiting “Ganapati worship” in NOD chapter 8.
  - On pages 46-47, they blaspheme SB 4.12.32 purport by stating, “The same principle also applies to Śrīla Prabhupāda’s teachings. **The ancient detail of Sunīti** not initiating her son should not be taken out of context and **placed on an artificially high pedestal. Exactly as in the case of Gaṇeśa worship, we should carefully analyze how Śrīla Prabhupāda answered explicit enquiries.**”
  - The authors water down Srila Prabhupada’s and Śrīla Bhaktisiddhānta Sarasvatī Ṭhākura’s criticism of Caste Goswamis, to legitimize FDGs practiced in apasampradayas and they recommend ṛtvikism.
  - On page 70 the author(s) state that “women can live alone”: the author(s) pull a magic quote out of their hats, in the form of a Śrīla Prabhupāda’s correspondence to a female disciple, as the real, absolute statement for all women to live alone and show that somehow it vetoes all other thousand places in his books and conversations wherein he had vehemently opposed this idea.

- On page 69 misquoting Srila Prabhupada’s lecture on Śrī Īsopaniṣad, Los Angeles, 8 July 1971. “**There is no difference between putra and chatra,**” has been taken out of its context, has been stitched a śāstra-viruddha narrative that women Dīkṣā-gurus can get protection from the disciples and is same as a mother being protected by her son.
- Anti-Varṇāśrama narrative:
  - In essence, the author(s) in their dozen pages of narrative, starting at page 56, they lead the readers to an indirect question as to whether ISKCON should implement Varṇāśrama or should they implement women dīkṣā-gurus.
  - In these pages they mainly conclude that ISKCON should give independence to women’s preaching aptitude even if the scriptures prohibit them.
  - On pages 56 and 57 they conclude through word jugglery that Lord Kṛṣṇa’s Vedic culture, Varṇāśrama system is a phantasmagoria and that they openly declare on page 60 that women can be independent in her old age which is totally against guru-sādhū-śāstras.
  - On page 59, they misuse Srila Prabhupada’s letter to Hamsaduta, 19 October 1974, out of context to stitch a narrative that Srila Prabhupada did not think Varṇāśrama system is necessary.
- Pro-feminist narrative:
  - The book dedicates 50 pages, starting at page 243 to paint that traditional Vedic culture is horrendous and that by tying “fragments” of Śrīla Prabhupāda’s statements from his lectures and conversations they build a successful narrative that Śrīla Prabhupāda was indeed favouring the western egalitarian and feminist agenda.